

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application.

In the Office Action of January 17, 2008, claims 1-4 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. Accordingly, claims 1-4 are at issue.

I. Objection To Claims

Claim 1 was objected to due to an informality.

With the current amendment, claim 1 is amended to accommodate the Examiner's request and to overcome objections. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 Indefiniteness Rejection of Claims

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

With the current amendment, claim 1 is amended to accommodate the Examiner's request and to overcome objections. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Watanabe* (JP 10-134619) ("*Watanabe*") in view of *Ellens et al* (2003/0026096 A1) ("*Ellens*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 1 now recites:

"the diverter sheet reflects light rays orthogonal to its surface back to the rectangular surface reflection sheet"

...and

“the diffusion sheet reflects light received from the diverter sheet to the side and corner reflection sheets.”

Watanabe fails to disclose anything pertaining to a diverter sheet which reflects light rays orthogonal to its surface back to a rectangular reflection sheet or a diffusion sheet which reflects light received from the diverter sheet to side and corner reflection sheets.

Ellens, similarly, fails to disclose a diverter sheet which reflects light rays orthogonal to its surface back to a rectangular reflection sheet or a diffusion sheet which reflects light received from the diverter sheet to the side and corner reflection sheets. Instead, *Ellens* discloses an optical conductor plate which provides for uniform emission of blue light laterally transmitted from blue LEDs located on the edges of the plate. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0026096 Para. [0020]. Accordingly, the optical conductor plate of *Ellens* is used to emit blue light from LEDs in a uniform manner and not to shield light rays orthogonal to its surface. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0026096 Para. [0020].

As the Applicant’s specification discloses, by providing a diverter sheet which reflects light rays orthogonal to its surface back to a rectangular reflection sheet or a diffusion sheet which reflects light received from the diverter sheet to the side and corner reflection sheets the corner areas dark spots in different regions of the LCD are eliminated. See U.S. Pat. Pub. 2007/0121320 Para. [0038]. Accordingly, the LCD panel of *Ellens* is incapable of producing this effect.

Therefore, because *Watanabe*, *Ellens*, and any combination of the two fails to disclose or even fairly suggest every feature of claim 1, the rejection cannot stand. Because claims 2-4 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 14, 2008

By: /Christopher P. Rauch/
Christopher Rauch
Registration No. 45,034
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000